

Response under 37 CFR 1.116 – Expedited Procedure

Serial No.: 09/815,891

Examiner: Yogesh C. Garg

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 and 22-29 remain in this application with claims 1, 4 and 22 being independent claims.

In the outstanding office action, independent claims 1, 4 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by *Schlossman et al.* (US Patent 6,320,944). Applicants respectfully assert that neither *Schlossman* nor any of the cited references disclose, teach or render obvious the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 4 and 22. In particular, *Schlossman* discloses that the call parameter information, the cost information and the charge information are generated at each of the client networks, i.e. the local PCs (elements 20A, 20B and 20C). This generated information at each of the local PCs is then sent to the configuration server (14) (See *Schlossman* column 3, line 36 – column 4, line 28). Having this information generated at each of the local PCs is precisely one of the identified problems that the present invention overcomes (see page 2 lines 17-28).

In fact by the Examiner's own admission, the information is all generated by the client network in both embodiments of *Schlossman* (para 3, last sentence of office action). In contrast, in the present invention the "call cost information" is generated in "a service provider network", not the client network (see for example claim 1). Therefore, as each and every element of the present invention is not disclosed, taught or rendered obvious by the cited references, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 3, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over the cited references.

Regarding dependent claims 5-12, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 4, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over the cited references.

134037
Page 6

Response under 37 CFR 1.116 – Expedited Procedure

Serial No.: 09/815,891

Examiner: Yogesh C. Garg

Regarding dependent claims 23-29, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 22, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over the cited references.

It is believed that the foregoing places the Application in condition for allowance; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections set forth in the Office Action, and full allowance of the claims. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

ALCATEL



Craig A. Hoersten
Reg. No. 38,917

Dated: July 13, 2005

Alcatel
Intellectual Property Department
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2
Plano, TX 75075
Phone: (972) 519-5143
Fax: (972) 477-9328